

REMARKS

Below, the applicant's comments are preceded by related remarks of the examiner set forth in small bold type.

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "many" occurs at line 3, the examiner assumes it should be "may". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 19 has been amended.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 9-11 and 14-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shostack et al. (Shostack), U.S. Patent No. 6,298,445.

As per claim 1:

Shostack discloses a method comprising:

detecting a possible security problem at a client location (6:43-46, wherein an intrusion is a possible security problem);

transmitting notice of the possible security problem across a network in real time to a home location remotely located from the location (6:53-57, wherein sending an alarm functions as transmitting notice of the possible security problem and the system administrator resides at a home location which is the local server);

determining at the home location an anomaly based on at least the possible security problem (7:15-16, wherein the security vulnerabilities function as anomalies and the local server is the home location); and

transmitting notice of the anomaly in real time to the client location (7:57-63; 9:10-21, wherein the software enhancement being sent is the notice of the security vulnerability, which functions as the anomaly).

...

Claims 4, 12, 24, 27 and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shostack (U. S. 6,298,445) as applied to claims 1, 9, 23, 26 and 30 above and further in view of Baker, U.S. Patent No. 6,775,657.

...

Claims 5, 13 and 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shostack (U.S. 6,298,445) as applied to claims 1, 9 and 30 above and further in view of Bowman-Amuah, U.S. Patent No. 6,697,824.

Shostack does not disclose or suggest "determining at the home location an anomaly based on at least the possible security problem and on information sent to the home location from at least one other client location," as recited in amended claim 1.

Shostack describes a network security detector 16 having a first application 48 that sends an alarm to a system administrator if an intrusion is detected (col. 6, lines 53-57), but does not disclose or suggest that the system administrator "determine[e] at the home location an anomaly

based on at least the possible security problem and on information sent to the home location from at least one other client location.”

What is lacking in Shostack is also not disclosed or suggested in Baker or Bowman-Amuah.

Claims 9, 17, 28, are 30 are patentable for at least similar reasons as claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

Cancelled claims have been cancelled without prejudice. Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a \$120 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, reference 10559-463001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/14/2005

Rex Huang
Rex I. Huang* for
David L. Feigenbaum, Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

* See attached document certifying that Rex Huang has limited recognition to practice before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office under 37 CFR § 11.9(b).